DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 193 641 CS 205 903

AUTHOR Bennett, Bruce
TITLE Some Future Directions in Writing Research.
PUB DATE Aug 80
NOTE 18p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Conference on the Teaching of English (3rd, Sydney, Australia, August 17-22, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies: *Educational Trends; Questionnaires; *Research Methodology; *Research Needs; State of the Art Reviews; Surveys; *Writing Processes; *Writing Research

ABSTRACT

A brief review of the state of the art of writing research suggests several areas in which future research could be profitable. These areas include: (1) extended use of individual case studies as a source of insight to the creative process, perhaps gathered together by a bibliographical center for classifying and indexing to demonstrate the variety of approaches to the composition of case studies and to establish an empirical base for properly grounded theories; (2) surveys and questionnaires implemented by participant observers to bring understanding to conflicts between teacher and student expectations; (3) interventions in the school routine with special tasks to help locate features of the writing process suitable for further study; (4) increased awareness of theories that underlie assumptions in the field of research on composing; and (5) reliance on a sense of audience and on publications to both communicate current research results and stimulate new research activity. (AEA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Bruce Bennett

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."
BRUCE BENNETT

ED193641

SOME FUTURE DIRECTIONS IN WRITING RESEARCH.

A paper presented at the Third Annual International Meeting on the Teaching of English (Sydney, August 17-22, 1980)

I am aware of my great cheek in offering comments on this topic at a conference that includes James Moffett, James Britton, Donald Graves and many others more qualified than I am to talk about future directions in writing research, including members of my own research team. For the truth is, I am not a professional educational researcher. My living is not dependent on my productivity in this field and my career in an Australian university English department is not strengthened by my involvement in what most colleagues would regard as a peripheral pursuit, a hobby in a department dedicated to the teaching and research of literature. Yet these factors may lend a certain independence of viewpoint, or a quaint charm, to my reflections on some of the problems and possibilities for those interested in research on writing.

There is a deliberate ambiguity in the topic, 'Future Directions in Writing Research', for I am interested both in approaches to research on writing and the problem of writing up such research. My day-to-day involvement in the teaching of English and Australian literature in a university has doubtless conditioned my interests and approaches to these questions, so, in the best traditions of educational research I should expose my subjectivity at this point and briefly outline any interest in the interdependence of literary and educational approaches to the study of writing.

For too long, teachers and researchers have described students' writing solely in terms of finished products - the examination answer, the essay, the précis, the short-answer exercise, the science report or the business letter. Similarly, literature has usually been perceived as a series of complete and finished works of art, conforming in varying degrees to certain generic expectations. But a more humane perspective on the work of the student writer as of the great artist

CS205903

or professional writer may be obtained if we investigate what lies behind the finished product. I have found my own understanding, and that of my students, has increased, for instance, when we consider together the changes of direction and revisions in the manuscripts of *The Waste Land* or *Sons and Lovers;* or when we consider the alternative endings of *Great Expectations;* or when we listen to Jack Hibberd or Barry Oakley or Frank Moorhouse talk about their work. The human dimension returns, and, I would submit, an important kind of knowledge is explored, which contributes to a fuller understanding of writing. Further, instead of encouraging a sense of reverence before the apparently immaculate conception and unsullied birth of a work of literature, we can show, through some of the processes of its composition, its kinship with our own struggling efforts. To know that Hemingway re-wrote the ending of *A Farewell to Arms* some 39 times, and still possibly didn't get it right, may be an encouragement to many of us - and especially to the many students who are encouraged to think that works of literature write, or type, themselves.

The first of a number of fruitful areas of research that I would suggest then, is this confluence of literary and educational interests in the process of writing. Interviews with writers, the study of manuscript revisions, biographical studies that analyse a writer's activity in relation to his place and time: all these approaches can be immensely suggestive to the researcher of writing, if one assumes that research is not always restricted to normative investigations, that insights into process can be derived from the extremely talented writer as from the virtual non-writer. There is scope here for literary sensitivities and insights (particularly the trained literary critic's ability to read for value and tone) to inform, and in turn be informed by, some of the best traditions of educational research.

What are these 'best traditions' of educational research? It will be obvious that I am concerned to introduce individual and personal

elements into my investigations and consequently, that I am inclined to see the best in what Rex Gibson[1] has called the 'counter-tradition' to a prevailing positivism in educational research, according to which subjective meaning is central to the research enterprise and human behaviour is located historically and socially. In this kind of research, as Gibson puts it, 'self-understanding, the intentions of the human actor, must...take precedence over causal explanations which lie outside the individual.' (p.24).

When I applied for an Education Research and Development Committee grant in 1975, inspired by the example of the work done previously by Britton, Burgess, Martin, Rosen, McLeod and others at the London University Institute of Education,[2] I was only dimly aware of this 'counter-tradition' in educational research. I knew that I was soft and that 'soft' research was the only kind I could really do, though I had managed to fall in briefly with computer analyses of essay marking in a public examination, before computers and I fell out. It was colleagues from the 'counter' university in Western Australia, Murdoch University, particularly David Tripp[3] and Andrew Sooby,[4] who demonstrated to me that this 'soft' research was perhaps the hardest of all and that a growing body of work was giving philosophical and methodological backbone to it.

So although my original application to ERDC asserted the paramount importance of intensive case studies of individual student writers alongside surveys and questionnaires, I was only gradually led into the green pastures of ethnomethodology, progressive focussing and the notion of case studies as 'bounded instances' (an expressive term borrowed by David Tripp from Rob Walker). I still see these terms through a glass dimly, but they increasingly make sense of an intuitive belief that educational research should aim for truthfulness above all else.

Of what, then, might this truthfulness consist? An early statement of some assumptions of our research[5] had a fighting tone: 'traditional

> educational research has often preferred a narrower "objectivity" with the result that much of it has been impeccable, but of questionable value. A team working on a broad-based project like this may produce new insights and generate new hypotheses as it proceeds: it may therefore give a more complete picture than would otherwise be achieved. If "truthfulness" is what we are concerned with (and this must be a more comprehensive notion than "reliability" and "validity" as traditionally defined, the questions to be asked must be penetrating and unblinkered.' (pp.5-6).

I doubt if any of us in the team of eight quite knew what we were groping towards in approving of that statement, except that we knew that there would be many faces of truth and that the questions we asked should be *genuinely* hard (not just in the statistical sense). The problem is that many of our questions remain unanswered; and although we covered ourselves by calling this a 'pilot study', there is a nagging sense that our readers would prefer neat answers in the back of the book to sets of further questions.

I would now like to consider the broad areas of our research, mention some of our tentative findings and indicate gaps or areas that demonstrate the need for further work. I will talk about these areas under the following headings: case studies; surveys and questionnaires; interventions; and theory.

1. CASE STUDIES

Because Andrew Sooby and Adrienne Walker are each dealing with aspects of our case study work during this conference, and Donald Graves is also here as an admirable exponent of this approach to writing research, I will touch only briefly on our experience and its possibilities of expansion and development.

But first, I want to quote some examples from literature and journalism of how case studies can be used, and abused.

The first is from ex Sydney-side Londoner Clive James's book, *Unreliable Memoirs*.[6] He is describing a Psychology assignment at Sydney University:

> "During the course of the year we had to assemble an elaborate case study of some real person. My clinical study was little Toni Turrell, sexy Shirley's sister. Five minutes into the Wechsler-Bellevue intelligence test I realised that little Toni was a hopeless moron who would yield up the same personality profile as a block of wood. So I excused her from any further tests and cooked up the whole thing. It was, if I may say so, a brilliantly convincing job. 'Toni: A Case Study' was my first attempt at a full-length fictional work."

Exposed here, I suppose, is the danger (as well as the potential) of the literary imagination let loose on applied research. While not claiming Clive James's powers of invention, I did attempt something like literary truthfulness in my study of a Eurasian student, "Marion", in which I established her sense of racial intolerance as a key factor in her personality and her writing, but then (mistakenly) attributed to her the words of a song called 'Half Breed' by Cher Bono, which Marion had used in an assignment. It was my mistake. Carried away by my theory about her, I had not properly checked my sources. Yet that error doesn't invalidate an approach that includes hunches and intuitions, provided these are properly checked.

MacDonald and Walker[7] have recommended for the writing of case studies a "fusion of the styles of the artist and the scientist" - something closer to "traditions in journalism, documentary film-making and the novel." One book which has something of this mixture is Al Alvarez's *The Savage God*,[8] an involved and personal, but also an analytical attempt to understand, not why people write, but why they kill themselves (wait for the connection):

> "I wanted the book to start" says Alvarez "as it ends, with a detailed case-history, so that whatever theories and abstractions follow can somehow be rooted in the human particular. No single theory will untangle an act as ambiguous and with such complex motives as suicide."

Alvarez starts the book with a sensitive and detailed memoir of Sylvia Plath, a close friend and 'successful' suicide, whom he knew in that extraordinarily creative period that preceded her death; the book ends with an introspective case study of a 'failed' suicide - the author himself.

In between, the book is packed with description, analysis, statistics accounts from literature, gossip, hearsay, quotations. There are loose ends everywhere; and insights galore into the human condition in extremis; a sense of personal pressure behind the explanations.

You are probably saying, that sounds an attractive way of writing up research for a popular audience, on a topic of great public curiosity and fascination, but what can it have to do with research on writing - so prosaic a subject, tracing the middle-ground of experience, of drudgery for many; no intensity; one of the rude mechanicals of expression; the condom of communication.

Yet when you begin to see this complex human process from the point of view of the learner, it is often exciting, or instructive, or both, particuarly when examined in the extremes of the virtual non-writer, or, in the following instance, the fluent and articulate 16 year old writer reflecting on how thinking and writing interact for him:

> "...if you just think, um, all these ideas will just rush through your brain and there's all these different ideas and they're just rushing through your brain and you're trying to figure out something, trying to think of something concrete - all flashing - you can, but as soon as you write a word on paper you've written that down and it's materialised it - that idea has materialised and it can't disappear. You can look at it and you can watch it and all your ideas can sort of focus on to that and continue on, instead of just flowing um all over your mind."

This might be a long way from scientific statement but it has the ring of personal authenticity; and it is one of many 'bounded instances' that we have collected of students reflecting on the process of writing. The voice of that student, images he uses, his speech cadences and pauses are at least as important to our understanding of writing as the flattened out, 'objective' statement that might emerge from an attempt to generalise the relationship between thinking and writing; and excitement is there in the intuitive realisation that order is created, for a moment, out of chaos.

David Tripp[9] has argued that "we should begin to collect, and make

sense of, for instance, classroom phenomena, not by applying theories developed elsewhere, but by collecting many 'bounded instances'... which, although constrained by the particularities of circumstance, may nevertheless contain more general truths." This would be practical 'action research' of the kind which teachers could carry out, containing no more in the way of research paraphernalia than a statement of method and context.

This, I believe, is a major possibility for writing research in Australia. If an agreed bibliographical centre could record and disseminate case studies of writers and writing and begin the task of classifying and indexing this work, we would achieve two ends: a variety of approaches to the composition of case studies which would open up this topic for wider discussion; and the building of an empirical base on which properly grounded theories might be built. I understand that Andrew Sooby will have more to say on this topic at the conference.

2. SURVEYS AND QUESTIONNAIRES

Although we asserted from the start our central concern with small-scale intensive work on case studies, we were seduced by the easy attractiveness of the large-scale surveys. In the end, the surveys became millstones, diverting us from the most original and potentially interesting parts of our work. Let it be a warning. But millstones or not, the surveys (of around 550 students in years 10,11 and 12 at four Western Australian high schools) enabled us to build up a general picture of writing in the schools under discussion, within which the individual cases could be better understood.

Using the categories devised by Britton and others of transactional, expressive and poetic writing, we spent a lot of time showing that transactional writing was an even higher percentage of all writing (86.9% in 1977 and 97% in 1978) than in the London sample, where transactional comprised 70.1% of all writing. We made it possible to talk more

informedly about the time given to writing in our sample schools when we discovered that the time spent writing in class as a percentage of the total time spent in class averaged 44% for year 10 students and 40% for students in each of years 11 and 12. Using our own types of writing categories, ranging through six types from copied notes to personal writing, we were able to show that of all the time spent writing in class over a period of two school weeks, more than 80% of writing was spent in copying notes or writing short answers (defined as one sentence or less). This left less than 20% of total writing time available for the other types of writing that were listed (more fully written report or summary in own words; essay based on facts; essay based on personal views; and personal writing, e.g. diary, story, poem, playscript).

The significance of such findings can be commented on as we have done, but further questions and analysis are required. For instance, why was the range of types of writing so narrow? And since developments in learning to write will most likely occur in the more extended writing activities, where a writer's intentions have some scope, why is note-taking so predominant?

Given more time and a commitment to classroom observation we could have addressed this question at some depth, attempting to follow up some of our own intuitions along with the following suggestive observations by Howard Gannaway[10] on how students might make sense of note-taking in school:

> Note-taking is an activity which some teachers include in their lessons. The meaning that teachers themselves give to note-taking may relate to views they hold about the need to store information for the future (perhaps in preparation for exams), or it may be concerned with beliefs the teacher has about the desirability of pupils practising written expression or even handwriting. There may even be one or two teachers who see it as a means of 'settling down' a class after some other activity. But if the teacher does not explain *his* reasons for the pupils' note-taking then I claim

> that they will make sense of it by reference to the teacher's personality ('Oh, he likes to give notes') or to verbal or other cues that the teacher gives. For instance, if the teacher says, 'We've got five minutes left so let's take some notes on what we've just done', then it is quite possible that the pupils will deduce that the teacher himself sees note-taking as a means of filling time. In the absence, then, of any such cues from the teacher, as I have said, the pupils will evaluate activities like note-taking according to how they enjoy it as a way of passing time. This will probably depend on how proficient they are at writing, how much they like writing, whether or not there is the possibility of doing other things which might be curtailed or hindered by note-taking (e.g. looking out of the window) or the desire to occupy one's hands, and so on. This would provide one explanation of why some pupils develop attachments to activities which teachers rate as having little or no value (e.g. decorating the margin of pages of written work).

There is clearly considerable scope for furthering the detailed observations and shrewd intuitions of Gannaway and other contributors to Stubbs and Delamont's highly suggestive book, *Explorations in Classroom Observations*.[11] Our analyses of kinds of talk associated with writing in the different subject areas might also have been analysed from closer in, in ways suggested by Stubbs and Delamont's book.

Our research converged on such issues as the prevalence of note-taking in the senior years of secondary school, chiefly through the case studies and through questionnaires answered by both teachers and students. Chris Jeffery's careful construction and analysis of these questionnaires[12] ensured that leading questions were avoided and students' and teachers' perceptions of the writing process were collated and summarised in language as close to the writers' own original terms as possible. Forty seven teachers from across the curriculum in the four project schools responded to the questionnaire, which had an 85% return rate. The conscripted students, of course, virtually all responded in one way or another.

The major finding of the questionnaires was that certain discrepancies existed between what teachers thought they were doing and what students thought they were doing in relation to writing: for example, students thought that most of their school writing was essays

(with the exception of year 10 students, who thought that most of their time was devoted to the writing of short answers to questions), whereas teachers thought they offered a wider range of which essays were one element. Teachers' responses to questions about 'actual' and 'ideal' writing tasks tended to more pragmatism than the students': only 16.6% of teachers opted for more 'creative' writing whereas 18% of year 10, 28% of year 11 and 43% of year 12 students responded in these terms. Whereas no teacher considered his or her aims to be to 'punish' students with writing, a number of students did, particularly in year 10.

What happens to completed writing? 20% of teachers said that discussion usually occurs whereas only 19% of year 10 students' responses, 2% of year 11 responses and 3% of year 12 responses indicated this trend. However, teacher and student respondents agreed that most written work is marked by the teachers.

The examples that I have just given are among many examples in Chris Jeffery's questionnaire that indicate the need for classroom research that would discover why intended 'messages' are not received or are interpreted differently as students attempt to make sense (or nonsense) of the tasks they are set.

We need also to penetrate different subject teachers' sense of their role as teachers of writing and how they understand the dynamics of their situation. When asked about the changes in writing that they would like to see between years 10 and 12, teachers focussed on increasing perception and imagination, greater control of language, more conciseness, greater sophistication and increasing objectivity. In trying to explain what prevents these changes from occurring, most teachers blamed deficiencies in the students (usually lack of ability or motivation) and the 'system' (including lack of diagnostic materials and lack of time). A much smaller proportion of teachers blamed themselves. What lies behind these patterns of response? Obviously, more research is needed, and I would suggest

that it will occur most fruitfully from the closer-in vantage point of the participant observer who takes the dynamics of school situations into account.

3. INTERVENTIONS

Most of our research was aimed at accepting the school situation as it was and describing or analysing writing and attitudes to writing in that situation. However, we occasionally intervened in the school programme to set special tasks. One such intervention was aimed at obtaining samples of writing in response to newspaper photographs which would enable us to compare 'developments' across years 10, 11 and 12. The aim was to analyse characteristics of the sample as a whole (596 scripts from four schools in 1977) and then to analyse 96 'sets' of writing by the same students in years 10, 11 and 12. The former part of the exercise has been completed, but the latter is not yet done.

When students' choice of form of writing was analysed we found, predictably perhaps, that story was by far the largest category in each of years 10, 11 and 12 and at each school (except for year 12 at the advantaged metropolitan area school, where it was close to the largest). Over the whole sample, the story category decreased with increasing age and the percentage of essays increased with age. This confirmed our view of the formal essay as the dominant model of extended writing in the final years of high school. Further investigation of the function and value of this model is required, perhaps along the lines of John Dixon's recent work with the Schools Council.[13]

In attempting to locate other features of writing that might be suitable as descriptors and indicators of change, after much discussion and some pre-testing we chose the following eleven categories: engagement with the task; fluency; presentational skills; humour; feeling for the whole; appropriateness and control of style; originality; reader interest; vocabulary; figurative language; speculation.

Three of us each separately rated 96 scripts on a scale of 0-3 or 1-3 according to these categories. Adrienne Walker has detailed this part of our research for the final report, and I will not describe it here, but our work has suggested that certain categories seem to repay further investigation: in particular, fluency, humour, figurative language and generalisation, all of which showed an increase with age. The features of skills and style showed very slight increases with age. Speculation was most notable for its absence; and any investigation of writing and thinking in the senior high school would have to ask why students, in the most speculative years of their lives, don't speculate in school.

4. THEORY

That canny critic and commentator on Australian literature and life, A.A. Phillips, has argued that we are a pragmatic people, with an 'obstinate bondage to the positive'.[14] We are said to turn aside, 'scornfully and yet timidly, from the glories and terrors of the incertitudes, from the exaltations of the mysteries.' Perhaps that accounts for our avoidance of speculation, our fear of extremes, our preference for norms. (As our satirists have shown us, Norm is the archetypal Australian: his enemies are tall poppies, dole bludgers, the third world and educational theories.)

Perhaps it is in response to this pragmatism in myself that I am arguing for small-scale empirical projects that will 'ground' our theories in actuality. But surely these two activities of investigating observable realities and then attempting to explain them (speculatively at first) in terms of general laws, principles or causes - must operate in tandem. My colleagues at Murdoch University insist on the importance of theory and I agree with them, in theory at least. For the research project in which I have been involved for the past three years has depended heavily on the theories of others (especially those developed

at the London University Institute of Education by James Britton and his colleagues) and we could not claim to have made world-shattering discoveries that would reconstitute existing theories of learning.

What seems to come through our study is a picture of writing as an individual activity with many variants, thus making generalisation, if not idiotic, at least hazardous. This observation alone would support the research efforts of Donald Graves[15] and Andrew Wilkinson,[16] who emphasise writing as an aspect of 'the whole child', not as a separate mechanical skill.

Yet much theory underlies our every statement in this field. The work of Piaget and Bruner, for instance, underlies so much thinking about the learning process that it is often assimilated unconsciously An example is the notion of 'decentering' - of moving from egocentric to non-egocentric modes of discourse - which Moffett[17] has explored and which informs the notion of a sense of audience in Britton's schema: to move in one's writing from a single, subjective point of view to an 'objective' stance that considers other points of view is held to indicate growth or development. And so it might, if we accept Piaget's biological evolutionary growth model of learning. But as Bruner has pointed out in introducing a volume of research studies honouring Piaget and his work,[18] there are real problems in discussing growth: whether, for instance, to postulate "stages" or to think in terms of gradual processes of growth. And how much do our generalisations about 'change and development' in terms of 'states' or 'stages' falsify the individual experience of learning (to write, for instance)? Bruner concedes that, for a particular child, considered in the light of his capacity to solve a particular type of problem, there will appear to be important discontinuities. How much more must such discontinuities occur outside the strictly cognitive realm, where feelings and moral judgement become part of the process? And what is the 'mature' state towards which such

learning behaviour is claimed to lead our students? Courtney Cazden[19] has prudently warned us against perceiving the stages through which a child passes on his way to 'mature knowledge' as being mere partial versions of 'adult knowledge'. Yet in observing, assessing and evaluating writers writing we are continually hopeful, as educators, of assisting our writers and their writing to 'grow', to 'ripen', to 'mature'. Such metaphors require the closest and most rigorous philosophical analysis, as they inform our covert notions of growth and development.

5. AUDIENCE AND PUBLICATIONS

This brings me finally to the question of an audience for research on writing. If truths are there to be found, and questions to be asked, to whom and how will these be communicated? What are the appropriate organs of publication ? Should research in progress be published? Fortunately for us, the Education Research and Development Committee changed its policy on dissemination in 1979 and various kinds of informal and formal publications were encouraged ahead of long formal reports that would gather dust on their shelves in Canberra. We have taken advantage of this in various formal and informal ways and used recordings of interviews and examples of students' writing at seminars, discussed interim findings of the research at conferences, published case studies for use by teachers at in-service courses and published articles based on the research in journals. Our interests, approaches, problems and difficulties have been more open than most research, and the actual investigation has often been delayed by answering letters or phone calls or writing reports; simultaneously we have been under much pressure to 'come up with the goods.' Yet the great bonus has been that others have been stimulated to new activity, and so have we, by this interchange.

Because of the broad-ranging nature of our inquiry and because we have disseminated our findings in different ways, we have not been too taxed as yet by the lack in Australia of a journal devoted specifically

to research in the teaching of English. The work of Diana Davis and Pat Diamond in building up the research section of *English in Australia* has set a lead, as has Diana Davis's compilation of a *Bibliography of Australian Research on English Teaching, 1960-1979.*[20] It may be premature to expect research and discussion journals in Australia of the quality of the American NCTE publications, *Research in the Teaching of English* and *College English* or, in England, Andrew Wilkinson's new journal, *Language for Learning*. Yet such journals help to create an audience for research and, provided the pitfalls of publish or perish are avoided, an independent Australian journal which keeps close contact with research in other countries, deserves to be started.

For it is clear from my short immersion in this field of educational research that a major human activity, writing - from the brief reminder note to the extended discourse or poem - is as yet very imperfectly understood. There is a note of considerable tentativeness in the papers of contributors to Cooper and Odell's book *Research on Composing: Points of Departure* (1978).[21] And so there should be - the tentativeness is appropriate. There is much to be discovered.

NOTES

1. Gibson, Rex, 'A Slave to Limit: the dogmatism of educational research.' *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 8, 1, 1978, 22-31.

2. See Britton, J., Burgess, T., Martin, N., McLeod, A. and Rosen H., *The Development of Writing Abilities 11-18*, MacMillan Education, London, 1975.

3. See Tripp, David, 'Some Reflections on the Nature of Educational Research,' to be published in the *Cambridge Action Research Network Bulletin*, 1980, available in mimeo from the author.

4. See Sooby, Andrew, 'Case Study Methodology,' Murdoch University mimeo, 1980.

5. Bennett, Bruce and Walker, Adrienne, 'The Development of Writing Abilities, 15 to 17: Research in Progress,' *English in Australia* no. 44, June 1978, 5-15.

6. James Clive, *Unreliable Memoirs*, Jonathan Cape, London, 1980.

7. MacDonald, B. and Walker, R., 'Case Study and the Social Philosophy of Educational Research' in Hamilton, D. et al (eds.) *Beyond the Numbers Game*, MacMillan Education, London, 1977.

8. Alvarez, Al. *The Savage God: A Study of Suicide*, Weidenfeld and Nicholson, London, 1971.

9. Tripp, David, op.cit.

10. Gannaway, Howard, 'Making Sense of School,' in *Explorations in Classroom Observation*, ed. Michael Stubbs and Sara Delamont, John Wiley, London, 1976, p.62.

11. Stubbs and Delamont, op. cit.

12. Jeffery, Chris. 'Teachers' and Students' Perceptions of the Writing Process', University of Western Australia, mimeo, 1980. The impetus for this 'open' approach to constructing and analysing questionnaires came from Bussis, A., Chittenden, E. and Amarel, M. *Beyond Surface Curriculum*, Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado, 1976;

and Barnes, D. and Shemilt, D., 'Transmission and Interpretation', *Education Review*, 16, 3.

13. See Dixon, John. *Education 16-19: The Role of English and Communication*, Schools Council and MacMillan Education, London, 1979.

14. Phillips, A.A., 'The Family Relationship' in *The Australian Tradition*, Cheshire-Lansdowne, Melbourne, 1966, 110-111.

15. See Graves, D. 'An Examination of the Writing Process of Seven Year Old Children,' *Research in the Teaching of English*, 9,3, 1975, 227-241.

16. See Wilkinson, Andrew et al., 'Assessing Language Development: The Crediton Project,' *Language for Learning*, 1,2,1979, 59-76.

17. Moffett, James. *Teaching the Universe of Discourse*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1968.

18. Bruner, J.S. (ed.), *Studies in Cognitive Growth*, John Wiley, New York, 1966, 5-6.

19. Cazden, Courtney B., 'The Development Process' in *Child Language and Education*, Holt Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1972, Ch.5.

20. Davis, Diana et al. *Bibliography of Australian Research on English Teaching 1960-1979*, Curriculum Development Centre, Canberra, 1979.

21. Cooper, Charles and Odell, Lee. *Research on Composing: Points of Departure*, National Council of Teachers of English, Urbana, 1978.

BRUCE BENNETT
Senior Lecturer
Department of English
University of Western Australia
Nedlands W.A. 6009.

August 1980.